



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/259,413      06/14/94      HARRIS      J      SYNE210C

HM12/1113

U.S. PATENT OPERATION  
DEPARTMENT 430, M/S 27-4-A  
AMGEN INCORPORATED  
ONE AMGEN CENTER DRIVE  
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91320-1799

EXAMINER

LILLING, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

33

DATE MAILED:

11/13/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**08/259,413**

Applica(s)

**HARRIS ET AL**

Examiner  
**DR. HERBERT J. LILLING**

Group Art Unit  
**1651**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 14, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 15 and 45-58 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 15 and 45-58 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 28, 30

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the prior art information disclosure statements filed December 16, 1999 and October 10, 2000 and the request for reconsideration filed June 14, 2000.

2. Claims 15 and 45-58 remain present in the instant application.

Claims 1-14 and 16-44 were previously cancelled in Paper No. 15 dated December 12, 1998.

3. Claims 15 and 45-47 and 50 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 36 of copending Application No.08/482,283. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are within the scope of the claimed invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided

the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 15 and 45-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Armes et al WO9216221.

Applicant has indicated that both of the priority documents clearly supports claimed 15 in the instant application as submitted in the fax of pages of 07/850,675 dated December 08, 1999. However, both of the priority documents 07/850,675 and 07/669,862 were abandoned prior to the filing of this instant application. There is a hiatus in the line of priority which prevents this Examiner to remove the above rejection. There are pending applications which may have a line of priority cases to support the instant claims but this line of priority fails to have the continued support.

The response by Applicant does not address the fact that there is a hiatus in the priority of the instant application. Thus, the rejections based on the art have been maintained. The incorporation by reference does not give priority to the abandoned references. Applicant is not entitled to the abandoned applications which were not copending in line with the instant application.

5

6. **No claim is allowed.**

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lilling whose telephone number is (703) 308-2034 and fax number (Art Unit 1651) is (703) 305-7939 or SPE Michael Wityshyn whose telephone number is (703) 308-4743. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

20

H.J.Lilling: HJL  
(703) 308-2034  
Art Unit 1651  
November 13, 2000

25

*Herbert J. Lilling*  
HERBERT J. LILLING  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1802 ART UNIT 1651